UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,870	02/27/2004	Vadim Fux	555255012558	7232

24325   7590   01/07/2008
PATENT GROUP 2N
JONES DAY
NORTH POINT
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Interview Summary	10/788,870	FUX ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Manglesh M. Patel_.

(3) _Mitchell Rose (App's Rep)_.

(2) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _28 December 2007_.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
    c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
    If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _Proposed Claims 24 & 29_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Chan & Mori_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☒ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See Continuation Sheet_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The proposed claim amendments were discussed. Specifically the language describing the order the steps are performed. The first steps of proposed claim 24 describe that the server stores the font capabilities list initially for all the client devices. The second step describes that text and font identifier information such as for example a font name is sent to the server. The client font identifier is then compared to the server identifier list, thus sending the lacking font structure data with text data to the device. Chan instead describes that the determining of font data is done on the client device (remote site) first (see abstract) before accessing font data from the font server. Thus the actual client device determines if the font is supported before communicating with the front server. Thus in Chan the device must store font capabilities to determine if it is necessary to access the font server for additional fonts thereby consuming device memory. However the proposed claims avoid this problem by having the device access the server thereby the actual client device doesn't store anything related to the font list.

Furthermore Mori teaches a request message that sends device information that includes width, height etc, however failing to show that the request message from the client device includes font identifiers with text data.

Also Independent claim 29 containing limitations from dependent claim 26 describing refraining transmission of redundant font data to a client device was briefly discussed.

Although proposed amendment appears to overcome the combination of references all responses are subjected to further search and consideration once submitted formally.